

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,479	10/17/2005	Mi Yeon Kim	P2958US00	8900
	7590 07/27/201 ASSOCIATES, PLC	EXAMINER		
8500 LEESBU		PORTER, WILLIAM ERNEST		
SUITE 7500 VIENNA, VA 22182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	22102		3623	•
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@PARK-LAW.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/553,479	KIM, MI YEON		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	WILLIAM PORTER	3623		

	WILLIAM PORTER	3623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appl for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26/a) and the appropriat	o ovtonoion foo
Learning of the life of the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (5) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w			appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment (s) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below). 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	fucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Beth V. Boswell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3, NOTE: An additional search to address the conjunctive 'and' in claim 1 will be required...

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 1 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments on claim and claim 8 were earlier presents a part of Remarks dated 12/16/2009 and responded to by examiner in Office Action dated 41/12/10. Hence, Examiner has no further response. Applicant's arguments filed 1 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that inherency is established with the extrinsic evidence, must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the reference. Examiner responds that is proper to take into account reasonable inferences from the reference at. "[II] no considering the disclosure of arerence, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Predat, 401 F.24 825, 826, 159 USPO 342, 344 (COPA 1968). See also, MPEP 2144.01.